UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/751,390	01/05/2004	Johannes Kaeppeler	03345-P0046A	2672

24126 7590 07/28/2008

ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS, LLC
986 BEDFORD STREET
STAMFORD, CT 06905-5619

EXAMINER	
MACARTHUR, SYLVIA	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1792	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10751390		KAEPPELER, JOHANNES	03345-P0046A

ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS, LLC
986 BEDFORD STREET
STAMFORD, CT 06905-5619

EXAMINER
Sylvia R. MacArthur

ART UNIT	PAPER
1792	20080722

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

This letter is sent to applicant to clarify the status of claims 15 and 16 which were inadvertently omitted in the Examiner's Answer (page 7) of 1/22/2008 and in the Final Rejection mailed June 5, 2007 (page 6). It is noted that both the Final Rejection and the Examiner's Answer failed to include claims 15 and 16 in the 103(a) rejection as being unpatentable over Rupp et al (US 6,740,167) in view of Burk, Jr. et al (US 5,788,777) though the body of the rejection/arguments in both actions includes a discussion of claims 15 and 16, see Final Rejection, pages 8, 9 and Examiner's Answer, page 9. Thus, the examiner wishes to apologize for the typographical error and clarify that the correct statement of rejection should read:

Claims 1, 8, 10, 11, and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rupp et al (US 6,740,167) in view of Burk, Jr. (US 5,788,777).

Furthermore, this correspondence is sent to verify that the reply brief filed 2/26/2008 has been entered and considered. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.

July 22, 2008

/Sylvia R MacArthur/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792